

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION No 65 of 1994

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.K.TRIVEDI

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

STATE OF GUJARAT

Versus

CHETANMUMAR NATVERLAL MODI

Appearance:

MS BR GAJJAR APP for Petitioner

MR RS SANJANWALA for Respondent No. 1

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE A.K.TRIVEDI

Date of decision: 16/10/98

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Ld. Advocate Mr.R.S.Sanjanwala appearing for respondent no.1 has stated at Bar that pending final hearing of the present proceedings, the subject muddamal goods have perished and have become totally useless and thereby respondent no.1 is not interested in claiming the custody of the said goods. That the present proceedings have been filed by the State to challenge the order of ld. Addl. Sessions Judge, Surat, dated 10.11.1993, passed in the proceedings of Criminal Revision Application No.

119 of 1993, whereby the Court has granted the custody of the subject goods to present respondent no.1.

2. In view of the fact that, at present, respondent no.1 does not desire to claim the subject goods by contesting the present petition, ld. APP Ms.B.R.Gajjar has stated at Bar that the petition may be disposed of as has become infructuous, because of the statement made at Bar by respondent no.1.

3. On the basis of above stated discussion, the petition stands disposed of as has become infructuous. Rule is discharged. Interim relief granted earlier stands vacated. No costs.

4. The trial Court is directed to proceed further with the pending case and to dispose of the same in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

sreeram.